

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-9, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shen et al. (6,414,661) in view of Hunter (6,441,560) and Yano et al. (6,317,138).

With regard to claims 1 and 9, the Examiner states that Shen et al. teaches an active matrix OLED flat-panel color display (column 1, lines 10-49), comprising: a) a plurality of light emitting elements and associated control circuits (figure 2, items 10 and 14); b) a programmable power supply connected to the control circuits (figure 2 and 3); c) a sensor for sensing the light to produce a feedback signal (figure 4a and column 9, lines 10-47); and d) a display controller responsive to the respective feedback signal for programming the programmable power supply to compensate for changes in the light output from the light emitting elements (figure 4a, item 30), and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Shen et al. apparatus to have a separate sensor for each light emitting element mounted on a common substrate as taught by Hunter because one would be motivated to replace a moving single sensor with stationary multiple sensors to speed up and facilitate real-time calibration and control. The Examiner also states it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the Shen et al. apparatus as modified by Hunter to have "plurality of light emitting elements for emitting light of **different** colors", as taught by Yano et al. because one would be motivated to produce a multi color display over a single color display in order to display more than one color in a multi color display also multi color displays are more commercially marketable. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

Contrary to the Examiner's initial description of Shen et al., there is no teaching therein of a programmable power supply connected to the control circuits thereof. Figures 2 and 3 referenced by the Examiner are entirely void of any such teaching. Shen et al. does demonstrate a feedback concept, but not feed back to a programmable power supply. Rather than employ a programmable power supply to compensate for changes in light output of all light emitting elements for a particular color, Shen et al. calculates correction coefficients for individual pixel drive currents and uses such individual correction coefficients to

control the output of individual pixels. The variable voltage source 37 in Fig. 3 of Shen et al is not a programmable power supply, but rather is used to provide a correction signal for each pixel (see, e.g., col. 6, line 54 to col. 7, line 15). Further in such regard, note that the output signal from Fig. 3 is a digital signal, which cannot be used as a power supply. The additional references of Hunter et al and Yano et al. also fail to teach the use of a programmable power supply in combination with a feedback signal for programming a programmable power supply to compensate for changes in the light output from the light emitting elements. Thus, even if the modifications of Shen et al. proposed as being “obvious” by the Examiner in view of the secondary references were to be made, Applicants’ claimed invention simply would not be obtained. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established. Should the Examiner decide to maintain such rejection, it is respectfully requested that the portion(s) of any cited art which is relied upon for such programmable power supply requirement (as opposed to calculation of individual pixel drive circuit correction signals) be specifically identified, as Applicants have not been able to identify any such teaching or suggestion in the cited art.

The Examiner further states that Applicant’s arguments filed 28 October 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In particular, while agreeing with applicants’ argument that “Hunter does not discuss a color display device nor does he show a programmable power supply for driving the display”, the Examiner states that he fails to see the relevance since Hunter which is a secondary reference from the analogous display art is being only used to teach the concept of, “a separate sensor for each light emitting element”, to modify the primary reference Shen et al. Such statement, however, is in fact relevant as the primary reference Shen et al also fails to teach such programmable power supply feature as discussed above. In further response to applicant’s argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant’s invention, the Examiner states that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., “correcting different colors in the display elements”) are not recited in the rejected claim 1. Applicants contend that such feature is in fact essentially recited in claim 1, as the claim requires separate sensors for sensing each color of light emitted by the display to produce feed back signals for each color, and a display controller

responsive to the respective feedback signals for programming a programmable power supply to compensate for changes in the light output from the light emitters.

In response to applicant's argument that the Examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, the Examiner states it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning, and that so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. It is respectfully urged, however, that the proposed reconstruction is not so properly limited only to the prior art teachings, as there is no teaching anywhere in the cited art with respect to employing a feedback signal in combination with use of a programmable power supply as required in the present claimed invention. Such feature is only suggested by Applicants' teachings, and the rejection is accordingly improper.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration of this patent application is respectfully requested. A prompt and favorable action by the Examiner is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe any remaining issues may be resolved via a telephone interview, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' representative at the number below to discuss such issues.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 33,564

Andrew J. Anderson/vjr
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: (585) 722-9662
Facsimile: (585) 477-1148